

Remarks:

1. Objections and Rejections.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation that the Examiner has withdrawn all of the previous objections and rejections. Further, Applicant acknowledges with appreciation that the Examiner has allowed claims 1 and 3-7 and indicates that claim 15 contains allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of its base claim, claim 9, and the intervening claims, claims 10-14. Nevertheless, claims 9-11, 13, and 14 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,139,273 to Schwarz *et al.* (“Schwartz”) and claim 12 now stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly rendered obvious by Schwarz, as applied to claim 9, in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,900,228 to Yapp. Applicant respectfully traverses.

2. Anticipation Rejections.

Claims 9-11, 13, and 14 stand rejected as allegedly anticipated by Schwarz. “A claim is anticipated if and only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. [Moreover, ‘t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.”” MPEP 2131 (emphasis added; citations omitted). The Office Action alleges that Schwarz describes each and every element as set forth in claims 9-11, 13, and 14. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Office Action contends that Schwartz

show[s] a multiblade blower comprising an impeller having a plurality of blades 120, 140 placed circumferentially, and taking in air from a side of an inner diameter end portion of each of the blades and discharging the air from a side of an outer diameter end portion of each of the blades by rotation of the impeller, wherein two or more of blade groups, in each of which said blades are placed in a ring shape, are placed, such that the blades 120 of an outer blade group are behind and extend beyond at least one inner blade 140 group at least in a radial direction,

Office Action, Page 2, Lines 18-24 (emphasis added). Previously, the Office Action relied on Schwartz to support the contention that the blades of the outer blade group were “between” the blades of the inner blade group. Office Action, Page 3, Lines 16-24 (mailed

November 17, 2004). Initially, Applicant maintains that given the distinctions in Applicant's claimed inventions, the Office Action is inconsistent in its interpretation of Schwartz's outer blades as allegedly both "between" and "behind" the inner blades. Nevertheless, Applicant proposes to amend claim 9 to clarify the distinction between outer blades placed "between" the inner blades and outer blades placed "behind" the inner blades.

In order to clarify this distinction, Applicant is amending claim 9 to include the following description:

wherein said at least one inner blade group comprises a plurality of main blades and said outer blade group comprises a plurality of auxiliary blades, and an inner diameter end portion of each of the auxiliary blades is placed behind a pressure surface of an outer diameter end portion of one of the adjacent main blades.

E.g., Appl'n, Paras. [0034]-[0036]. In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant maintains that Schwartz fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention as described in claim 9. Further, because claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 depend from claim 9, Applicant also maintains that these claims are not anticipated by Schwartz. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejections of claims 9-11, 13, and 14.

3. Obviousness Rejection.

Claim 12 stands rejected as allegedly rendered obvious by Schwarz in view of Yapp. Claim 12, however, is dependent from independent claim 9. "If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim dependent therefrom is non obvious." MPEP 2143.03. Thus, in view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, and because the Office Action does not contend that the elements described above which are missing from Schwartz are supplied by Yapp, Applicant maintains that the obviousness rejection of claim 12 is untenable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness rejection of claim 12.

Conclusion:

Applicant maintains that the above-captioned patent application, as amended, now is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution of this application may be furthered by discussing the

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 018842.1271

application, in person or by telephone, with Applicant's representative, we would welcome the opportunity to do so.

Dated: June 23, 2005

Baker Botts L.L.P.
The Warner, Suite 1300
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2400
(202) 639-7700 (telephone)
(202) 639-7890 (facsimile)

JBA/djw

Enclosures

